

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

TAMINA CHRISTINE SHOCK,

Plaintiff,

vs.

LAS VEGAS METROPOLITAN  
POLICE DEPARTMENT, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:14-cv-01261-RFB-CWH

**ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on Defendants' Motion to Strike (#11), filed September 11, 2014, and Plaintiff's Motion to Strike (#12), filed September 16, 2014.

The complaint in this matter was filed on July 31, 2014. (#1). Defendants filed their answer on August 25, 2014. (#4). On September 9, 2014, Plaintiff filed what has been designated as a reply to the answer. (#10). By way of this motion, Defendants request that Court strike the reply (#10) as an unauthorized pleading. Plaintiff's motion requests that the Court strike Defendants' motion to strike.

Plaintiff is proceeding in this matter *pro se*. As a general rule, when a plaintiff proceeds *pro se*, his or her pleadings should be construed broadly. *Bretz v. Kelman*, 773 F.2d 1026, 1027 n. 1 (9th Cir. 1985). Nevertheless, even *pro se* litigants must comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *King v. Atiyeh*, 814 F.2d 565, 567 (9th Cir. 1987); *see also Jacobsen v. Filler*, 790 F.2d 1362, 1364 (9th Cir. 1986) ("pro se litigants in ordinary civil case should not be treated more favorable than parties with attorneys of record"); *Carter v Comm'r of Internal Revenue*, 784 F.2d 1006, 1008 (9th Cir. 1986) (pro se litigants expected to abide by the rules of the court in which litigation proceeds).

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 7(a) provides for only the following pleadings: (1) a complaint, (2) an answer to a complaint, (3) an answer or counterclaim designated as a

1 counterclaim, (4) an answer to a crossclaim, (5) a third-party complaint, and (6) an answer to a  
2 third-party complaint. Replies to an answer are permitted if the ordered by the court. Even  
3 construed broadly, Plaintiff's reply (#10) does not fall into any of the categories of permissible  
4 pleadings. Nor has the court ordered a reply. Consequently, the Court will grant Defendants  
5 request to strike the reply (#10) as improper under Rule 7(a).

6 Based on the foregoing and good cause appearing,

7 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Defendants' Motion to Strike (#11) is **granted**.

8 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** Plaintiff's Motion to Strike (#12) is **denied**.

9 DATED: September 16, 2014.

10  
11  
12   
13 **C.W. Hoffman, Jr.**  
14 **United States Magistrate Judge**  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28